

## **PLANNING COMMITTEE**

### **MINUTES OF MEETING HELD ON TUESDAY, 16 MARCH 2021**

#### **Present:**

Councillor Diana Ruff (Chair) (in the Chair)  
Councillor Jayne Barry (Vice-Chair)

Councillor William Armitage  
Councillor Peter Elliott  
Councillor Maureen Potts  
Councillor Tracy Reader  
Councillor Ross Shipman  
Councillor Heather Liggett

Councillor Andrew Cooper  
Councillor Mark Foster  
Councillor Alan Powell  
Councillor Kathy Rouse  
Councillor Pat Antcliff

Councillor Pat Antcliff (in attendance)

#### **Also Present:**

R Purcell	Assistant Director - Planning
C Wilson	Senior Planning Officer
J Fieldsend	Legal Team Manager (non contentious)
A Maher	Senior Governance Officer
N Kwasa	Senior Governance Officer
M E Derbyshire	Members ICT & Training Officer
N Calver	Governance Manager

#### **PLA/ Apologies for Absence and Substitutions** **83/2**

**0-21** Apologies were received from Councillor Carol Huckerby who was substituted by Councillor Heather Liggett. Apologies were also received from Councillor Jacqueline Ridgway.

#### **PLA/ Declarations of Interest** **84/2**

**0-21** No declarations of interest were declared.

#### **PLA/ Minutes of Last Meeting** **85/2**

**0-21** The minutes of the last meeting held on 11 February 2021 were approved as a true record, subject to clarification on Minute: PLA/80/20-21. Councillor Tracy Reader had raised concerns about applications NED/20/00931 and NED/20/00932/LB – Ridgeway. In particular, she had raised concerns that they might result an inappropriate development, which could have an adverse impact on the Greenbelt and had felt that the Committee would need to assess the possible impact in its determination of the applications. Councillor R Reader asked that her concerns be recorded in the minutes.

**PLA/ NED/20/00833/FLH - Cutthorpe**

**86/2**

**0-21**

The Planning Officer presented the report. Verbal representations were heard in objection from John Robinson and in support from the Applicant's Agent, Anthony Jenkins. Members had the opportunity to question speakers and officers. The application was discussed in length, including concerns about how the incremental increase in the roof height of 250mm had been allowed to occur. The Committee also discussed the resiting of the office pod, parking associated with it and the need to maintain natural screening of the pod from the highway due to its close proximity and the lighting emanating from it. In regards to the use of the office pod, the AD of Planning confirmed that it is ancillary to the house and the parking is sufficient. However, if it becomes clear that it is being used independently then a change of use would need to be considered as a separate application from that currently being considered by the Committee.

Following the discussion, Councillor Armitage moved a motion to **APPROVE** the application as per Officer's recommendation, with an additional condition that there should always be appropriate screening of the office pod from the highway and that this should transition to natural or indigenous hedges, trees or bushes should the current hedge die or be removed. This was seconded by Councillor Reader.

**RESOLVED –**

**That the Committee GRANT consent to retain the development as constructed subject to the following conditions, with the additional condition regarding screening as noted above, the final wording of which is delegated to the Planning Manager (Development Management):**

- 1. The development hereby approved shall be carried out in accordance with the submitted plans, unless otherwise specifically agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority or otherwise required by any other condition in this decision notice.**
- 2. The home office hereby approved shall only be used by residents of the property known as "Betron" and by no other person.**
- 3. The home office hereby approved shall be used solely as an ancillary building in association with "Betron" and shall not be independently used or sold.**
- 4. Any supplementary or replacement hedge planting around the office pod along the road frontage shall be of an indigenous species.**

**PLA/ NED/20/01137/FL - Holmesfield**

**87/2**

**0-21**

The Planning Officer presented the report. Verbal representations were heard in objection from Maureen Turner, Michael Dawson, Maureen Greenland and Robin Greetham. Verbal representations were heard in support from the Applicant's Agent, Susan Crowley and the Heritage Consultant, Mel Morris. Members had the opportunity to question speakers and officers. The

application was discussed in length by the Committee who had concerns around the building of new houses in amongst traditional farm houses in a Green Belt area. The Committee also raised concerns that the very special circumstances have not been met and that the public benefit as described of securing the future of a group of buildings which currently have no economic use did not outweigh the harm. It was also noted that the application might raise issues for the public trying to access the public footpath which currently exists on the site.

Following the discussion, Councillor Elliott moved a motion to **REFUSE** the application, contrary to Officer recommendations for the following reasons;

1) The application site is located primarily within the Green Belt. The proposed development is considered to be unacceptable as the 4 new dwellings would cause substantial harm to the openness of the Green Belt and so constitute inappropriate development. There are not considered to be very special circumstances that outweigh this harm. The proposal is therefore considered contrary to policy GS2 of the North East Derbyshire Local Plan and the National Planning Policy Framework when read as a whole.

2) The application site is located within the open countryside. The proposed development, by reason of its prominent location overlooking the Millthorpe valley, scale, massing and the materials proposed would not be in keeping with the character of the area and represent a prominent intrusion and so fail to protect and enhance the natural environment. The proposal is therefore contrary to policies GS1, GS6 and H12 of the North East Derbyshire Local Plan and the National Planning Policy Framework when read as a whole.

3) The site is located within the Cartledge Hall Conservation Area. By reason of their prominent location, scale, massing and the materials proposed the new buildings proposed would harm the intrinsic character of the Conservation Area. The public benefits are not considered proven and so do not outweigh this harm. The proposal is therefore contrary to policies GS1 and BE11 of the North East Derbyshire Local Plan and the National Planning Policy Framework when read as a whole.

This was seconded by Councillor Armitage.

#### **RESOLVED –**

**That the application be REFUSED, contrary to Officer Recommendations, for the reasons detailed above with the final wording delegated to the Planning Manager in consultation with the Chair and Vice Chair of the Committee.**

#### **PLA/ Planning Appeals - Lodged and Determined**

**88/2**

**0-21**

The report gave details of those Planning Appeals which had been lodged and determined. The report noted that four appeals and one enforcement appeal had been lodged. Two appeals had been decided, one had been allowed and one had been dismissed.

**RESOLVED** - The Committee noted the report.

**PLA/** **Matters of Urgency**

**89/2**

**0-21** There were no matters of urgency to consider.